

REMARKS

Claims 1, 17-19, 33-49 and 51-67 were pending with claims 2-16, 20-32 and 50 being previously cancelled while claims 33-35, 37-39, 41-42 and 51-67 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. In this paper, independent claims 1, 40 and 47 have been amended and claims 69, 72 and 75 have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Accordingly, upon entry of this paper, claims 1, 17-19, 33-49 and 51-68, 70-71, 73-74 and 76 will be pending upon entry of this paper.

I. Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office has rejected claims 70, 73 and 76 as follows at page 2 of the present, Final Office Action:

3. Claims 70, 73 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In each of claims 70, 73 and 76, the recitation "means for translating a pressing force ..." is vague and indefinite as to what is being set forth, particularly as to what disclosed structure it refers.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the following remarks.

The structure being referred to is the covering (see the "*wherein the covering provides*" clause in claims 70, 76) and the housing (see the "*wherein the housing provides*" clause in claim 73). As for the confusion regarding the act of "means for translating a pressing force," Applicant provides the following simple analogy: when a person driving a car applies a 'pressing force' to a padding member a steering wheel to actuate a vehicle's horn, the padding member acts as an intermediate element that effectively translates the driver's pressing force to the vehicle's horn – in other words, the driver never directly applies a pressing force to the vehicle's horn, but, rather, the force is directly applied to the padding area by the driver, *which then carries or translates the pressing force to the vehicle horn*. The same may be said in the present disclosure – a user presses / applies a 'pressing force' to the covering or the housing such that the covering / housing translates or carries the pressing force in a uniform manner to the cutting edge / blade.

For at least the above remarks, Applicant submits that the rejection to claims 70, 73, 76 should be withdrawn. However, if the Office believes that subject matter of claims 70, 73, 76 could

be better clarified, Applicant invites Examiner Dexter to phone Applicant's representative in order to collaboratively arrive at claim language that would be acceptable to the Office by way of an Examiner's amendment.

II. Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

The Office has rejected the claims of the present invention as follows in the September 14, 2010 Final Office Action:

5. Claims 1, 17-19, 40, 43-49, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550 in view of at least one of Phillips et al., pn 2,885,933 (hereafter Phillips '933), Phillips et al., pn 2,993,421 and Kang, pn 4,12,827 or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550 in view of at least one of Phillips et al., pn 2,885,933 (hereafter Phillips '933), Phillips et al., pn 2,993,421 and Kang, pn 4,12,827, and further in view of Beroz et al., pn 6,543,131.
6. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550 in view of at least one of Phillips et al., pn 2,885,933 (hereafter Phillips '933), Phillips et al., pn 2,993,421 and Kang, pn 4,12,827 or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550 in view of at least one of Phillips et al., pn 2,885,933 (hereafter Phillips '933), Phillips et al., pn 2,993,421 and Kang, pn 4,12,827, and further in view of Beroz et al., pn 6,543,131, and further in view of Johnson, pn 6,658,978.

In view of the following remarks, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has carefully considered all of the Office's remarks in the present Action under the "*Response to Arguments*" header and thanks Examiner Dexter for his time in the earlier Interview. Applicant still believes that the previously-asserted remarks in Applicant's last paper (along with the cited support at MPEP §§2143.01, V., 2145, III., 2145X., D. and MPEP §2173.05(g)) make it clear limitations of claims 1, 40 and 47 are patentably-distinguishable over the applied prior art. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution to a favorable conclusion, Applicant has elected to incorporate the subject matter of allowable dependent claims 69, 72 and 75 within each of independent claims 1, 40 and 47. Because of this, claims 1, 40, 47 and all of the

currently-pending dependent claims should be allowable over the applied prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection to and allowance of all of the currently pending claims is solicited.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-3145, under Order No. 216683-114025 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 3/10, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph V. Coppola

Registration No.: 33,373

HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ AND
COHN LLP

38500 Woodward Avenue

Suite 100

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5048

(248) 566-8500

Attorney/Agent For Applicant